7/4/71

Dear Paul (JNS),

With non-working "working" company here, my own work if interrupted and awkward. Soon we are expecting others, so I'll resume with your unanswered correspondence. Your 20 memo "Documents Received from the Archives" begins with three names. You say there is nothing in the name files, according to Archives.

Edward A. Brand (other than CD 6: 195;7:169). Without taking time to check any files, my card say what I should have sentyou and will if you want and I haven't, a 12/22/67 Gary Sanders memo I have under Oswald, False,Dallas. It gives his address as 1924 Riverway Lane.

Jorge Salazar: I have no card.

Maria Vidales, no card.

I think you have my Castorr notes. They both told me about these Cuban meetings, and they may have mentioned these names. I agree with you that Had I had anything to do with the investigation, I'd have investigated these Cubans, but do you think that with its own limited responsibilities and in the absence of specific directive from the Com ission their failure to carry this further was, from their point of view, improper.

General comments on hasty glance at other listings: anything new on Jones invoice would be interesting.

If my recollectionis not faulty, I think there were reports in N.O. that remarks were added to pages of books charged to LHO and leaflets were left in some.

Connally reminds of Mrs. Jerry says that Sylvia says she is a real buff and collector.

Molina: there were four agents among 6 members of local CP, and there was overl ap of memberships, this suspicion of Molina and abundant reporting. Even the Burchers planted an agent! The police had one, the FBI, and another agency. Withholding could be to hide/ possible identification.

FBI memo 10/1/70: I entirely agree with our estimate and it may be that under Gesell's decision in my 2569-70 it legally overrides 5 USC 552 exemptions when taken with Archives own re ulations that everything possible will be declassified even if within exemptions. I'd appreciate two full-sized copies, one for me and one for Bud, hopefully clear enough for further reproduction. If unclear, can you please make several others in the event Bud finds relevant to oral argument spectbo appeal, which from your description is not impossible. I remind you also of Bobby's letter quoting Warren on this.

Butler: if I haven't so said before, you do not exaggerate when you say no further interview is incredible. There may even have been one in DC.

Release Ferrie et al: no statement is proper, for they did have rights and JG did believe feebs, else he'd not have released. He is a strange cat, despite your Shaw opinions, and from my observation he thinks he is zealous in protecting the rights of the accused. I could give you examples, but aside from the first and I think excessive and impulsive and wrong comments when plagued by the press, do you know of anything prejudicial he said of Shaw? I agree other things could be prejudicial, but he he did not so regard. The alternative was complete silence on assassination.

Comment on other, some provocative items when I see them. HW